

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and title of the invention have been amended. Claims 13-22, 25 and 26 are pending and under consideration.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION:

The title of the invention is deemed not be descriptive. It is respectfully submitted that the present title of the invention overcomes the objection.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter cited in claims 13, 25 and 26. Although the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, the specification is amended herein for the Examiner's further clarification. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS:

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendments to the specification further clarify the features at issue.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 13-26, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuda et al. (U.S. Patent 5,963,280 A) in view of Oyama et al. (U.S. Patent 5,808,708 A) and further in view of Miyashita et al. (U.S. Patent 6,011,602 A).

Using independent claim 13 as an example, this claim recites the first slopes mainly receive light from said primary light source and said second slopes mainly receive light from said second primary light source. The Examiner relies upon Miyashita et al. as disclosing this feature. This reference discloses a single light source 322 which directs light to a light guide 307 via a light input surface 315 thereof. The light guide 307 has projections 312 with a reflection layer 313 on a top thereof. Thus, light is only output from the side surfaces of the projections 312, towards a prism array 321. Miyashita et al., FIG. 23; Column 21, lines 18-31. FIG. 23 of this reference teaches only a single light source 322, yet light 305 is emitted from both sides of the projections 312, to be received by both sides of the prism 321. Thus, one side of the prism 321 does not mainly receive light from one light source, and the other side of the prism 321 does not mainly receive light from another light source. Thus, even if Miyashita et al. were combined

other references which teach multiple light sources 322, the effect of the different side of the prism 321 mainly receiving light from respectively different light sources would not be achieved.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuda et al. in view of Oyama et al. and Miyashita et al. as applied above to claims 13-16, and further in view of Ohkawa (U.S. Patent 5,997,148). Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuda et al. in view of Oyama et al. and Miyashita et al. as applied above to claim 13, and in further view of Arai (U.S. Patent 6,049,649).

The comments above also apply here. Ohkawa and Arai do not overcome the above deficiencies on Okuda et al., Oyama et al. and Miyashita et al. and are not relied upon by the Examiner to do so. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

9-10-04

By: _____

Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501